

United States Patent and Trademark Office

				<u> </u>
UNITED STATES DEPARTMEN	70	r có	MME	₹Œ
United States Patent and Traden	aark	·Vofi	ice	1
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PA	TŘN	TSL		L
P.O. Box 1450	_ /	//		/
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1480	╮'	/ I	$\overline{}$	

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/786,433		02/27/2004	Desmond Margetson	238.005A	2800	
20311	20311 7590 07/14/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
MUSERLIAN AND LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP			ноок, Ј	HOOK, JAMES F		
475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH NEW YORK, NY 10016		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3752				

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/786,433	MARGETSON, DESMOND \bigvee
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	James F. Hook	3752
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rein fixed provided the specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a r ply within the statutory minimum of thir d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. SANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ Th 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin 11.	ccepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyan action is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/786,433

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown. The patent to Brown discloses the recited elongated metal straw A,B provided with a plurality of perforations a,b at one end thereof to act as a filter against any particles in a liquid to be consumed when the inserted end is placed in a drinking vessel, where it is considered merely intended use to press it vertically into the vessel, however, the straw of Brown is capable of being inserted into the vessel vertically as is also suggested by the figures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown.

The patent to Brown fails to disclose which type of metal is used, however, it is considered merely a choice of mechanical expedients to choose any metal capable of use with the invention, where stainless steel is an old and well known metal used in the

Application/Control Number: 10/786,433

Art Unit: 3752

presence of liquids to prevent rust, where it would be undesirable to have a utensil that is to be used for imbibing fluids have rust thereon, therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use any type of metal for forming the straw of Brown including using stainless steel, as such is a known metal used in the presence of liquids which is superior to other metals in that it does not rust, which would make the utensil more suited for use for imbibing fluids as such is merely a choice of mechanical expedients requiring only routine skill in the art to utilize the more desirable material.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Sussman. The patent to Brown discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of reciting the actual size of the holes used. The patent to Sussman discloses the recited straw comprising a plurality of perforations A,A', where the holes are disposed on each end of the straw, the straw can be made of any suitable material including paper, glass, and plastic, where at least one set of holes would be within the drinking vessel during use, the holes can be formed of a diameter of 0.01 inches which converts to approximately 0.25mm. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the holes in Brown to be of any size including 0.25mm in diameter as suggested by Sussman as such teaches the desirable size of holes used in a drinking straw provided with holes and what is old and known as in the art, where such would insure that less particles would enter the straw and at the same time would add aeration to make the fluid being imbibed more appealing.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sussman in view of Smaczny. The patent to Sussman discloses all of the structure set

Application/Control Number: 10/786,433

Art Unit: 3752

forth above with the exception of disclosing that the straw can be formed of metal, specifically stainless steel. The patent to Smaczny discloses that it is old and well known in the art of straw making that drinking straws can be formed of various materials including various metals and plastics. It is considered merely a choice of mechanical design to use stainless steel as a specific type of metal as such is an old and well known metal used where rust is undesirable on a metal item to be exposed to liquids. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the straw in Sussman to be made of any material, as Sussman suggests, where it is known in the art that metal can be used in place of plastic when forming drinking straws as suggested by Smaczny, where such would be sturdier than plastics and less breakable than glass, and where the use of stainless steel is considered an obvious choice of mechanical expedients where any suitable metal can be used and stainless steel is old and well known for it's properties of resistance to rust in the environment of liquids.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Mitchell, Stoessel, Mack, Lottick, Williams, III., Wilk, Saito, Adaska, Manning, and Whiton disclosing state of the art straws and pipes, some provided with holes or of metal.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James F. Hook whose telephone number is (703) 308-2913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday, work at home Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mar can be reached on (703) 308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James F. Hook Primary Examiner Art Unit 3752

JFH